Pocket’s theory of child support, law, and systemic reform is not reducible to a single cause or grievance. It is a whole architecture, a framework of thought that pulls together philosophy, economics, justice, history, and lived experience into one relentless pursuit: to expose how systems that claim to serve actually extract, and to demonstrate how individuals can reclaim agency within structures that were never built to honor them. At its heart, Pocket’s work is about transformation—of law, of family, of finance, of trust itself. This essay attempts to tell that story in full, in theory, in nearly four thousand words, not as a detached commentary but as a living testament to what Pocket was trying to do.

Pocket (theorist 1)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 2)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 3)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 4)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 5)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 6)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 7)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but

for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 8)'s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 9)'s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 10)'s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 11)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 12)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 13)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 14)’s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but

for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 15)'s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.

Pocket (theorist 16)'s approach to child support was not about refusing responsibility for children, nor about denying the importance of family obligations. Rather, it was about questioning the architecture of obligation itself. Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, with its reimbursement formulas and federal incentives, created a machinery where states profit from fractured families, where non-custodial parents—often fathers—are transformed from human beings into streams of revenue. Pocket recognized that in such a system, every payment becomes more than support; it becomes evidence of bondage, an involuntary tax disguised as love. In theory, his work tried to demonstrate that the law had inverted natural responsibility into contractual coercion. He was not asking for abandonment of duty but for a restoration of choice, equity, and dignity. To Pocket, the question was always deeper: what happens when love is legislated, when care is commodified, when family is processed through bureaucratic courts? The theory was to tear open that veil, to show how absurdity had taken root in codes and statutes, and to demand a reconciliation rooted not in punishment but in regenerative justice. He wanted systems to nurture, not to consume.